



Studies of the Hittite Particles, I

H. A. Hoffner, Jr.

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 93, No. 4. (Oct. - Dec., 1973), pp. 520-526.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28197310%2F12%2993%3A4%3C520%3ASOTHPI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aos.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEW ARTICLE

STUDIES OF THE HITTITE PARTICLES, I

H. A. HOFFNER, JR.

YALE UNIVERSITY

This article, which forms the first installment in the author's planned studies of the Hittite sentence particles, focuses upon the particle *-za/-z*. Although he agrees with the provisional designation of the particle as "reflexive," the author seeks to demonstrate a wide range of uses, some in nominal sentences and others in verbal ones. Occasionally the presence or absence of the particle signals an implied opposition of the transitive and intransitive action types.

A. Introduction. THE APPEARANCE OF THE BOOK *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*¹ by Onofrio Carruba of the University of Pavia, Italy, marks a significant forward step in the understanding of the enclitic particles of the Indo-European languages of ancient Anatolia. In this book Carruba has built not only upon the labors of his predecessors, such as Hrozný, Ungnad, Götze, Friedrich, Sommer and others, but also upon his own earlier studies, most important of which was his article "Hethitisch *-(a)šta, -(a)pa* und die anderen 'Ortsbezugspartikeln'" in *Orientalia* N.S. 33 (1964), 405ff. But in *Partikeln* Carruba broadens the scope of his investigation to include not only the other sentence enclitics of cuneiform Hittite (Neshite), but also the "Satzpartikeln" of Luwian, Palaic, Lycian and Lydian, other Indo-European languages spoken and written in early Anatolia.

By "Satzpartikeln" Carruba means those enclitic morphemes which in Hittite attach themselves in a more or less fixed sequence to the first word of the sentence. But, as Carruba himself is careful to point out, these enclitics do not *always* attach themselves to the first word in the clause. There are occasions when a sentence enclitic attaches itself to the second or third word in a clause. Yet the percentage of cases in which the support for the enclitic is a not the first word in the clause is very small, so that their total number is negligible.³

¹ *Incunabula Graeca*, vol. XXXII, Roma, Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1969. This volume will hereafter be abbreviated *Partikeln*.—The present article and others to follow in the series "Studies in Hittite Particles" are in lieu of a review of *Partikeln*. They are affectionately dedicated to the memory of Albrecht Goetze (1897-1971).

² See the literature cited in *HE* (1960), 131-33, 147ff.

³ For Carruba's discussion of these instances and the inference which he draws from them regarding the origin of the "Ortsbezugspartikeln" see *Partikeln*, 20-21.

The chain of enclitic particles in Hittite contains six ranks (or "slots").⁴ In four of these ranks one may choose between two or more mutually exclusive particles. The particles which share the same rank perform the same syntactic function in the sentence. In rank one, three (*nu, šu, ta*) of the five must be word-initial,⁵ while the remaining two (*-ma-, -(y)a*) may not be word-initial.⁶ Particles of this rank are conjunctive or disjunctive.⁷ Rank two may be filled by *-wa(r)-* or by zero. *-wa(r)* indicates the presence of direct discourse.⁸

Rank three may be filled by various forms of the third person enclitic pronoun (*-aš-, -an-, -at-, -e-, -uš-*). Particles of this rank indicate the presence of a third person subject or direct object. Because only one particle can fill each slot, it is impossible in a single Hittite sentence to indicate by sentence enclitics both a third person subject and a third person direct object. Such a chain as **n(u)-aš-an* ("and he him") is impossible. This rank too may be filled by zero. There is no marker for the first or second person subject in the chain of sentence enclitics. The closest approximation to such is the particle *-za-* (rank five), or the particles *-mu-*,

⁴ See Table 1, and E. Laroche, *BSL* 53, 161.

⁵ *HE*² (1960), 155ff. Carruba discusses these (*Partikeln*, 51-65).

⁶ *HE*² (1960), 154-55. Carruba does not discuss these in *Partikeln*.

⁷ *HE*² (1960), 154ff. Carruba stresses the disjunctive aspect, when he writes: "Mit anderen Worten, während *nu, -ma, -a* einen tieferen Abschnitt der Handlung und/oder des Gedankenganges kennzeichnet, etwa unseren längeren Pausen (Punkt) entsprechend, bezeichnen diese Enklitika [*-kan, -šan, -ašta, -apa*], die man demnach enklitische Adverbien nennen könnte, die örtlichen und zeitlichen Zusammenhänge der Handlungen untereinander" (*Partikeln*, 18).

⁸ *HE*² (1960), 148-49 (not studied in *Partikeln*).

naš-, *-ta-*, *-šmaš-* (rank four), when they occur in the nominal sentence.⁹

Rank four can be filled by the particles *-mu-*, *-naš-*, *-ta-*, *-ši-*, *-šmaš-*, or by zero. Particles of rank four are described as pronouns of the dative, locative or accusative cases. When they appear in nominal sentences, those which belong to the first or second person stand in apposition to a subject translatable by English "I, we, you," which is normally expressed elsewhere in the sentence either by a non-enclitic pronoun (*uk*, *ammuk*, *weš*, *anzaš*, *šumeš*, *šumaš*) or by the ending of the verb "to be" (*ešmi*, *ešši*, *ešun*, *ešta*, *ešwen*, *ešten*, *eš*, *ašallu*, *ešli/ut*). In Old Hittite no enclitic subject pronoun of the first or second persons was employed in the nominal sentence. When the practice began (late 15th century B.C.) of indicating by a sentence enclitic first or second person subjects of nominal sentences, the particle *-za* (rank five) was employed for the function. Later, when

independently corroborate each other completely. Enclitic subject markers could be sought by speakers of Hittite only in two ranks: rank three for the third person subject, and rank five (only later rank four) for the first and second person subject. Speakers would never have employed *-za-* as a subject marker in the nominal sentence, had it not already served to reinforce or resume the subject in the verbal sentence. Carruba is also right (p. 47) that in verbal sentences the description "reflexive" does not adequately describe the particle's function.

But though Carruba has correctly understood the essential function of *-z(a)*¹¹ as a subject-resumer, he has left many of its derived usages unexplained and has quite honestly admitted his perplexity over the use and non-use of *-za* in clauses which to him appear identical. It seems to me that with all respect to the many fine contributions of this latest discussion we are now in a position to say much more. In fact, were Carruba's presentation here only an article in a journal devoted to one aspect of the problem, one would not expect the discussion to be comprehensive. But in a book entitled *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln ...*, one is entitled to not only fresh ideas but an organized summary of all previous still valid discussion. There is, for example, no discussion of the verbs whose meanings are quite different when they are construed with *-za* from when they are not (*eš-* [mediopassive] "to sit, sit down," and *kiš-* "to happen; become something," *da-* "to take," *peda-* "to take off, carry away," *tarḫ-* "to have the upper hand, subdue, conquer," *auš-* "to see, experience" [on the foregoing words see summarily *HE*², 132-33], and *mald-* "to recite, speak, make a public proclamation [without *-za*]; take a vow, commit oneself to something [with *-za*; E. Laroche, *La prière hittite* (1964), 8-12]), nor of the verbs which virtually always construe with *-za*: *ilaliya-* "to desire," *malai-* "to approve, agree, consent," *markiya-* "to disapprove," *UL mem(m)a-* "to refuse," *kap-puwai-* "to consider" (but not when it means "to count"), *ḫa-* "to believe in, trust," *dušk-* "to rejoice, entertain (someone)," *ša(i)-* "to be angry," (2) *ḫaš-* "to give birth to, sire," (3) *waš-* "to buy," *uš(ša)niya-* "to offer for sale," *ḫappa/irai-* "to sell," *ḫappar iya-* "to transact business with," *išḫiulaḫ-* "to give instructions to."

Those verbs which when they are accompanied by *-za* must be differently translated offer in the contrast of meanings clues to the fundamental significance of the particle. Thus *da-* means "to take (and subsequently employ)," while *-za da-* means "to take for oneself."¹²

Rank numbers					
1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>nu</i>	<i>-wa(r)-</i>	<i>-aš-</i>	<i>-mu-</i>	<i>-za-</i>	<i>-kan</i>
<i>ta</i>		<i>-an-</i>	<i>-ta</i>		<i>-šan</i>
<i>šu</i>		<i>-at-</i>	<i>-du-</i>		<i>-(a)šta</i>
<i>-(y)a-</i>		<i>-e-</i>	<i>-ši-</i>		<i>-(a)pa</i>
<i>-ma-</i>		<i>-uš-</i>	<i>-naš-</i>		
			<i>-šmaš-</i>		

Table One: the 6 ranks of the sentence particles.

the dative/accusative form of the non-enclitic personal pronoun (*ammuk*, *anzaš*, *šumaš*) was beginning to supplant the older nominative forms (*uk*, *weš*, *šumeš*) in the role of subject indicator (14th and 13th centuries B.C.), corresponding dative/accusative enclitic forms were employed instead of *-za* in apposition to their non-enclitic counterparts or to the finite form of the verb "to be": *aššiyan-naš-wa-naš ḫR.MEŠ ešwen* "we were devoted servants" (XXIII 1 i 31-32; second half of the 13th century B.C.).

B. The particle *-za*. Rank five can be filled by the particle *-z(a)* or by zero. Carruba is right, when he seeks the unifying function of the particle in "Bezug ... auf das Subjekt."¹⁰ It is unfortunate that my solution to the problem of the particle's use in nominal sentences, which offers a vital clue to its overall employment, was in press at the time this book appeared (1969). The conclusions which the author and I reached in-

⁹ H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *JNES* 28 (1969), 225-230.

¹⁰ *Partikeln* (1969), 50.

¹¹ On the use of the allomorph *-z* as a dating criterion see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *JNES* 31 (1972), 16-21.

¹² A. Götze, *ArOr* 5 (1933), 10-12.

The mediopassive verb *eš-* without *-za* must usually be translated "to remain seated," while with *-za* it is regularly "to take one's seat" (German *sich setzen*).¹³ There is a marked tendency for the mediopassive verb *kiš-* when it is to be translated "to become something else" (German "(zu) etwas werden"), to be associated with *-za*.¹⁴

¹³ A. Götze, *ArOr* 5 (1933), 4-5.

¹⁴ *HWb* 110. E. Neu, *SBoT* 5 (1968), 97-98 note 1, maintains that the presence of the particle does not alter the meaning of the verb, but modifies or emphasizes it "aspektisch." He points out the tendency not to employ *-za* in the older texts, a tendency—I might add—which affects the particle's overall employment and not just with this particular verb. In my opinion the aspectual difference to which Neu alludes cannot be conveniently separated from the question of "meaning" or "translation." The difference in aspect which the users of the Hittite language felt when they employed *-za* in the same clause with *-za* inevitably influences the choice of English or German words to translate the verbal idea. With only a few exceptions the syntactical structure of the clauses with *-za* differs consistently from those without the particle. If one concentrates on "translation," one will not always detect the difference. German *werden* is properly employed in both situations. But whereas, when the particle is absent, the nominative case form(s) in the clause are perceived by the speaker as subject(s), when the particle is present, one or more of the nominative case forms is perceived as predicate. Without *-za* the verb was understood as somewhat equivalent to English "come into existence, happen, take place." Of course, this opposition was not marked by the employment of *-za* in Old Hittite texts and in some Middle Hittite ones. Thus most of the exceptions which Neu has cited (*SBoT* 5 [1968], 95-98), where according to the rule *-za* should appear, are found in Old and Middle Hittite texts. As Houwink ten Cate has shown, some *Muršili* prayers derive from the language forms of the Old and Middle Hittite period, so that *na-at ... kat-la-wa-a-lar ... ki-ša-a-ru* (from *Muršili-Prayers* C II 51f.), which expression is also found in the Middle Hittite *Mašat* letter (*ABoT* 65, 7), must certainly be acknowledged as an archaism and not evidence that the rule governing *-za* with *kiš-* during the empire period was inoperative.

It is not the failure of *-za* to occur when it might be expected which should pose problems for the rule, especially since the major part of the examples are older texts or texts which have an *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, but rather the appearance of *-za* in cases where it seems to have no justification according to the rule. But here, as Neu himself admits (*SBoT* 5 [1968], 97 note 1), the

Götze¹⁵ was on the right track, when he compared use of *-za kiš-* with that of *-za iya-*, which often takes a double object: *nu-war-an-za-kan LÚ MUTI-YA iyami* "I will make him my husband" (*JCS* 10 [1956], 94f., A iii 15, A iv 7), and other exx. cited by Götze. Yet since, as Götze himself noted, *iya-* without *-za* also takes the double object (and that in texts from all periods), the parallel is not as complete as it would be for Carruba's case of *-za ... ḫalziššai-* "to name (object 1) (object 2)."¹⁶ One wonders if *ḫalzai-ḫalziššai-* does not also construe with *-za* on other grounds, since one finds it associated with *-za* even when there is no double object: *nu-za 4UTU-ŠI 4UL ḫal-za-[a-i]* (XXI 16 i 24; *Ḫattušili* III), *nu-za-kán A-BU-ŠU ŠUM-an ḫal-za-iš* (XXIII 72 obv. 38; MH Mita of Paḫḫuwa),^m *Ke-eš-šī-iš-za giŠŠUKUR ša-ra-a da-a-aš UR.TUR.ḪI.A-ya-za EGIR-an-še-et ḫal-za-iš*, "Kešši took up (his own) spear, and he called (his own) dogs behind him (XXXIII 121 ii 11; this use of *-za* for "[his/her/their] own" will be discussed further below), *am-mu-uk-wa-za du-ud-du: ḫal-zi-iḫ-ḫi*, "(the cow calls out to the Sun-god:) I have a complaint" (XXIV 7 iii 22; contrast *duddu ḫalzai-* without *-za* in XXX 10 rev. 23 and IV 47 i 8-9), *GAL-iš-za 4UTU-uš EZEN-an i-e-et nu-za 1 LI-IM DINGIR. MEŠ ḫal-za-i-iš*, "The great Sun-god made a party and summoned the one thousand gods" (XVII 10 i 19; Old Hittite Telepinu myth; compare also XXXIII 4+ i 5; XXXIII 24+ i 16; *KBo* IX 127+XXVXI 41 i 14-19), *nu-mu-za LUGAL-un La-ba-ar-na-an ḫal-zi-i-e-er* (XXIX 1 i 25) but *nu GIŠ.DAG-an a-ra-am-ma-an ḫal-zi-iḫ-ḫu-un*

examples are very few. The example from the Šuppiluliuma II text *KBo* IV 15 must be considered together with a detailed grammatical analysis of the very late texts. Carruba too in his list of problematic uses of *-za* (*Partikeln* 48) finds an exception to Götze's rule (*ArOr* 5 [1933], 7ff.) in the Tudḫaliya IV text XVIX 1 i 17, where according to him *man-a-za ŠA 4UTU ŠI-ḪUL-lu k[uwa]pi kišari* cannot mean "but if at any time the (situation) of His Majesty becomes threatened [lit., "evil"]." If the rule applies here, *ḪUL-lu* ought to be predicate, while *ŠA 4UTU-ŠI* ought to be subject. Perhaps Carruba is right. If so, then at least two of the very few examples of the appearance of *-za* contrary to Götze's rule occur in the very late texts of the reigns of Tudḫaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II. It does not, in any event, invalidate Götze's rule, which still explains the employment of the particle with *kiš-* in texts composed from Šuppiluliuma I to Tudḫaliya IV and with few exceptions for texts of the last two decades of the empire.

¹⁵ *ArOr* 5 (1933), 9.

¹⁶ *Partikeln* 48.

(XXIX 1 i 34), *na-aš-ma-an-za-an-kán ta-ma-iš ku-iš-ki pa-ap-ra-an-ni še-er šal-zi-an har-zi*, “or (if) anyone else has named him/her for uncleanness” (Tunn. i 3), *ma-a-na-an-za šal-za-a-i-ya* (ABoT 21 + obv. i 14). Furthermore, there are other verbs which can and do take double objects (*te-/tar-* “to designate as, declare to be,” *šallanu-* “to raise up to be,” *išhai-* “to provide someone with something,”), but which do not associate with *-za* in these constructions: *nu-šmaš TUR-lan Labarnan tenun* “to you I have declared the young man to be the Labarna” (I 16 ii 2-3), *takku ... A. ŠA.ĪIA ŠA LÚ GIŠ. TUKUL harkantan taranzi*, “if they declare the fields of a craftsman to be vacated” (Hittite law 40), *n-an-z-(š)an haštalín LUGAL-un šallanuttén*, “raise ye him to be a valiant king” (I 16 ii 24) but *nu idalun ši wattan huwappan šallanuškizzi*, “he raises up a bad day to be an evil” (Song of Ullikummi tablet 1, A i 6), *MÍ.MEŠ wan-nummiuš aniyattan išhai*, “he provides the widow women with a task” (1966/c, 7; ArOr 33 [1965], 337-38). It would appear then that the presence of *-za* is not necessary for the double object construction, and that the verb *šalzai-* often associates with *-za* when no double object is involved. This is not to deny, however, Carruba’s legitimate observation of the correlation between *-za šalzišša-* and the double object construction, even if, as I have shown above *šalzai-* occasionally governs a double object without *-za* (XXIX 1 i 34).

The verb *tarh-*, which with *-za* is transitive (“to subdue, defeat”) and without *-za* is intransitive (“to have the upper hand”), requires no special treatment here. But the verb *auš-*, which was first studied with regard to its *-za* constructions by Götze¹⁷ and has now been mildly called into question by Carruba,¹⁸ deserves a few comments. Carruba put his finger on a crucial passage, when he selected XVII 6 (“*Illuyanka C*”) i 19ff.: *zik-a-war-ašta GIŠ luttanza arha le autti ma(n)-war-ašta arha-ma autti nu-wa-za DAM-KA DUMU.MEŠ-KA autti*, “you must not look out of the window. If you look out, you will see your own (-za!) wife and your own children.” Carruba suggests that it means to see something which belongs to the subject, even if not physically. He then cites XII 2 iv 25, *KBo VI 34 i 35ff.*, and Ullikummi tablet 1, *passim*: *man DN₁ ANA DN₂-i memiškiwan daiš* versus *nu-za ... PA-NI ZI-ŠU memiškiwan daiš* (“to his own mind”) as further illustrations of the principle. This usage of *-za* to identify the grammatical subject as possessor of some person or object mentioned in the clause is actually much more widespread in Hittite than Carruba’s remarks would indicate. For the contrast of *IGI.ĪIA-wa dai-* with and with-

out *-za* an instructive passage analogous to Carruba’s *KBo VI 34 i 35ff.* is *Īattušili i 67-69*: *nu-za-kán IGI.ĪIA-wa ku-wa-at-ta-an A-NA KUR LÚ.KÜR an-da-an na-a-iš-ki-nu-un nu-mu-kán IGI.ĪIA-wa LÚ.KÜR EGIR-pa Ū-UL ku - iš - ki na-a-iš*, “toward whatever enemy land I directed my eyes, no enemy was able to turn my(!) eyes back.”¹⁹ Had the *IGI.ĪIA-wa* in the second clause belonged to the enemy, who is the grammatical subject of *naiš*, the particle *-za* would have appeared again in the second clause.

Other sentences can be adduced to illustrate this common use of *-za* to either strengthen a possessive pronoun explicitly expressed in the same sentence or implied. In either case the person identified in the possessive pronoun must be the same as the subject of the sentence: [*nu URU Īal-p*]a *pa-it nu-za ŠA A-BI-ŠU [e-eš-har EG]IR-an ša-an-aš-ta*, “[and (Muršili I)] went to [Aleppo] and avenged his own father’s [blood]” (*BoTU 20 ii 10-11*), *nu-za ma-a-an tu-el ma-aš-ša-an A-NA SAG.DU-KA ZI-KA Ū A-NA RA-MA-NI-KA ge-en-zu har-ši ŠU. ĪIA-uš-za a-ra-aš-za-an-da har-ši nu ma-a-an A-NA SAG.DU ŪTU-ŠI ZI ŪTU-ŠI RA-MA-A-AN ŪTU ŠI ge-em-zu QA-TAM-MA Ū-UL har-ši ŠU.ĪIA-KA-ya-mu a-ra-aš-za-an-da QA-TAM-MA Ū-UL har-ši*, “if you do not have just as much affection for the ‘head,’ and the ‘life’ and the ‘person’ of His Majesty as you do for your own (-za) ‘head,’ ‘life’ and ‘person,’ if you do not hold your hands protectively about me as about yourself (-za), (*Īukk. i 22ff.*),²⁰ *nam-ma-an-za-an A-NA SAG.DU-ŠU še-er an-za-a-aš-ša [A-NA DUMU].MEŠ-ŠU še-er li-ni-ga-nu-ut*, “he made him swear loyalty to himself, but us (he made swear loyalty) [to] his [son]s” (*KBo IV 4 iv 59-60*; *AM 140f.*), *nu-za ŠEŠ-aš-an kat-ta-an pē-eš-ki-it [lūa]-ra-aš-ma-za lūa-ra-an kat-ta-an pē-eš-ki-it*, “brother betrayed his own brother, friend betrayed his own friend” (*KBo II 5 iv 16-17*; *AM 190f.*), *nu-za ŪSTAR GAŠAN-YA pa-ra-a ha-an-da-an-da-a-tar ... ti-ik-ku-uš-ša-nu-ut*, “Ishtar, my lady, revealed her own (-za) divine power” (*Īatt iii 15-16*), *am-mu-uk-wa-za É.DINGIR-LIM-YA pa-aš-ša-aš-ši*, “I am guarding my own temple” (*XIII 4 iii 25-26*), *ma-a-an e-eš-ša-na-aš-ša ku-iš-ki šarni-ik-zi-il pl-ya-an har-zi nu-za-ta SAG.DU-ZU wa-aš-ta*, “when someone has paid the *šarnikzil* for homicide, he has purchased his own life (lit. ‘head’)” (*XIII 9 ii 3-4*; this example I include because although in Imperial

¹⁷ ArOr 5 (1933), 12f.

¹⁸ Partikeln 49f.

¹⁹ Compare: *ku-mar-bi-ya-aš IGI.ĪIA-wa Ū-UL nam-ma ma-an-za-az-zi* (XXXIII 120 + i 20-21) for the thought.

²⁰ Compare the similar phraseology and contrast in the Middle Hittite protocol XIII 20 i 30-31.

Hittite the verb *waš-* "to buy" regularly associates with *-za* lexically, it does not in OH or regularly in MH: therefore the *za-* must have a function different from simple association with *waš-*; *nu-za-kán* DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU *pa-ra-a šu-ú-i-iz-zi*, "(if a mother removes her garment from her son,) she thus disinherits her own (*-za*) son ('sons' probably a mistake)" (Hittite law 171), etc. The passage XXXIII 121 ii 11 cited above in discussion of *-za hałzai-* probably means "called his *own* dogs after him." Similarly XXXIII 12 iv 7-8: *nu-za* GUD.ĪIA AMAR-ŠU *pé-en-ni-iš-ta* UDU.ĪIA-*ma-za* SILÁ-[ZU *pé-en-ni-iš-ta*], "each of the cows [looked after her] own calf, each of the ewes [looked after her] own lamb."

Therefore the question arises: if one can often account for the presence of *-za* with *auš-* ("to see") and other verbs in terms of a stated or implied possessive relationship to the object of the verb, to what extent are we justified in positing a specific lexical nuance of *-za auš-* as opposed to *auš-*? Probably the situation with *auš-* is not different from that with *šak-*, where Goetze²² demonstrated a distinct nuance "to acknowledge (as one's superior)" whenever the verb was accompanied by *-za*, or from *kaneš-* "to know, recognize," which in Old Hittite never associated with *-za*, but which in Middle Hittite appears with that particle in the Kantuzili prayer with the special sense of "owning up (to a sin), confessing that (the sin) is one's own" (XXX 10 obv. 25ff.). None of these verbs became regularly associated with the particle as though *-za* were necessary to express each of the verb's many meanings. In this respect these three verbs are unlike the limited number of verbs cited above which always appear with *-za*. It would appear that *auš-* originally associated with *-za* only when the object of the verb was something which belonged to or was intimately related to the seer. This stage in the development is still represented in the Muršili II treaty passage: *ṁPÍŠ.TUR-aš-ma-kán wa-aš-tál ku-it uš-ki-iz-zi* (Kup., d, 40), where it is "his own" sin which Mašḫuiluwa sees, and where it is unnecessary to posit a special sense of *-za auš-* "to see in a dream, experience etc." See also XIV 24, 7-8. Another passage which is helpfully free of any abstractly conceived objects (such as "sin", divine power", etc.) is *KBo XVI 25 i 31-32: nu-za-ta LÚ UGULA LI-IM LÚ DUGUD-ša* [. . .] NINDA.ERÍN.MEŠ-ŠU ZÍ.DA.[DURU₅] *me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da a-uš-du*, "let the commander-of-1,000 and the dignitary wait for (lit. 'look to meet') their (lit. 'his') own (*-za*) bread rations and [moistened] flour!" But there gradually developed a custom of employing *-za* with the verb, whenever that which was seen was an

object which was perceived by an inner sight (dreams, divine power, personal sins).

The verb *šakuwai(a)-* "to look, see" like its synonym *auš-* also occurs sometimes with *-za* and sometimes without. But the factor which determines the need for *-za* with *šakuwai(a)-* is by no means the same as with *auš-*. It is in fact the same factor which operates with the verb *tarḫ-* (see below): when the verb is employed transitively and thus takes a direct object, the particle *-za* will regularly accompany it. When the verb is perceived as intransitive and takes no direct object, the particle will be absent. One can demonstrate the operation of this criterion by citing examples with and without the particle. With *nu-za* DUMU-*an ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-zi* (Ullikummi tablet 1, A iv 11), *na-an-za-an ša-ku-wa-it* (Ullikummi tablet 2, B iv 12), *nu-za* ⁴É.A-*an ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-zi* (Ullikummi tablet 3, A iii 25). Without: *nu-kán* ⁴UTU-*uš n[e-pi-ša-az kat-ta] ša-ku-wa-i-ya-at* (XXIV 8 iv 22-23 cf. 30-31). But the clearest example, which also shows the contrast of constructions, is Ullikummi tablet 1, A iv 33-34, which Carruba himself cites as a problem passage for which he can offer no solution (page 47): [(*nu-kán* ⁴UTU-*uš ne-pi-ša-az*) *kat-ta ša-ku-wa-it nu-za* ⁴U¹-*lu-kum-mi-in ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-zi* [⁴U¹-*lu-k*] *um-mi-ša-za (ne-pi-ša-a)n* ⁴UTU-*un ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-zi*], "The Sun-god looked [down] from heaven and saw Ullikummi. Ullikummi also saw the heavenly Sun-God." To Carruba's remark "*-z ... sakuwai-* neben dem einfachen *sakuwai-* nicht zu erklären ist" we can reply that the criterion for the opposition is a simple and consistent one, which even corresponds nicely to the English translation "look" (intransitive) and "see" (transitive).

The writer has discussed in an earlier study²³ the difference in meaning between *ep-* and *-za ep-*.

Of great interest is still another verb, whose occurrence is frequent and whose association with *-za* at first seemed erratic and unpredictable. At the time I had concluded my 1969 study²⁴ of *-za* in the nominal sentence E. Laroche suggested to me by letter that I investigate the problem of *ed-* and *azzik-* "to eat" and the conditions for its association with *-za*. The results of that investigation are the following: it appears that whenever the verb *ed-/azzik-* "to eat" takes an expressed direct object, it does not associate with *-za*: *ša-na-ap az-zi-kán-zi* (*KBo III 60 ii 3, 5*, Old Hittite *Menschenfresser* text), *ša-na-ap e-ez-ta* (*KBo III 60 ii 18*; see also iii 3, 9), *nu NINDA-an az-za-aš-te-ni* (I 16 iii 34, cf. 48), *ša-na-aš-la e-az-ta* (*BoTU 12A i 8*), *nu šu-me-in-za-an-pát UZU.1 e-ez-za-aš-du* (*KBo VIII 35 ii 20'*), *nam-ma NINDA ma-aḫ-ḫu-e-el-la-an* ¹⁸IN-BU-*ya e-ez-za-az-zi* (*KBo*

²² *ArOr* 5 (1933), 12f.

²³ *JCS* 23 (1970), 20-21.

²⁴ *JNES* 28 (1969), 225-230.

XIII 62 obv. 9), *na-aš e-du-un-na Ú-UL* (Al. Tabl. 125:13), *ku-it-ma-na-at UN-aš-na a-ú-i e-ez-za-a-i* (XIII 4 iv 5, cf. 39-40), *nu a-pu-u-un ḪA.LA az-zi-ik-kán-du* (XIII 2+iv 29), *[ku-wa-a]t-wa-ra-an e-ez-za-at-le-ni* (XXXIII 121 ii 20), *na-an-za A-ḪI-TI-YÁ na-at-ta ku-wa-pí-ik-ki e-du-un* (XXX 10 obv. 16) is a problem, but may be due to influence of the preceding clause which has *-za* and which firms with it a single thought unit, *na-at Ú-UL ku-uš-ša-an-ka e-du-un* (XXX 10 obv. 13) in the same context is correct, *UZU.Ì e-ed* (KBo IV 6 i 9), *nu UZU.Ì a-da-an-zi* (VII 41+iv 17), *ne-l-e ar-ḫa a-da-an-zi* (VII 1, KBo III 8, i 18), etc. To multiply further examples would have little value. A few exceptional cases exist, where *-za* appears when *ed-* takes a direct object: XXX 10 obv. 16 (see above), *LUGAL-uš-ša-za ku-it UD-ti-ti az-zi[-ik-ki-iz-zi]* "that which the king eats daily" (KBo XV 2 i 17).

When the verb *ed-* "to eat" is used intransitively (that is, does not take a direct object), it appears sometimes with *-za* and sometimes without. Without *-za* it occurs in: I 16 ii 33, KBo XVII 1 iii 15, iv 6, KBo XVII 4:8 (all Old Hittite texts), and VII 24 obv. 9, XXV 23 i 21, 31, 46, iv 55 (both inventory texts from the very late period of Tudḫaliya IV). This construction is the less common. Much more common when *ed-* takes no direct object is for it to be associated with *-za*. Of the large number of possible examples I will cite only a sample: *nu-za UD-an 2-ŠU 3-ŠU e-ed* (I 16 iii 30), *nu-wa-za az-zi-ik-kán-du ak-ku-uš-kán-du* (BoTU 23A ii 14), *nu-za e-za-at-ten e-ku-ut-ten* (KBo V 3 iii 37), *nu-uš-ma-aš a-da-an-zi* (XXVI 23 iii 4 with *-šmaš* standing in for *-za*), *na-at-za a-ta-an-zi* (IBoT I 36 iv 39, *-at* is nom. pl. subject, not object), *[EGIR-an-na]-aš-ma-aš az-zi-ik-kán-zi* (XXXVI 35 i 27, *-šmaš* standing in for *-za*, no object), *e-te-er-ša-ma-aš* (XXXVI 67 ii 17, same phenomenon). It appears then that in the earliest period *-za* was not employed at all with *ed-*. It was introduced eventually in those constructions where *ed-* was used intransitively. What makes the opposition *ed-* "eat (something)" *-za ed-* "eat (intransitive)" so curious is that it evidences precisely the opposite distribution from *eš-* "to sit, remain seated" and *-za eš-* "to occupy (a land)" (transitive),²⁵ and *tarḫ-* "to have the upper hand" and *-za tarḫ-* (with expressed obj.) "to subdue (someone)." In other words, the particle *-za* does not always mark the transitive in the transitivity-intransitivity transformation. Yet, that the paramount opposition associated with the presence or absence of *-za* with these three verbs is the transitivity-intransitivity one cannot be disproved. *A priori*, given the normal function of the particle in making reference to the subject of the sentence, one would be more prepared to

accept its association with the intransitive than with the transitive.

As stated earlier, a handful of verbs quite regularly associate with *-za*. For these verbs there has been proposed no opposition of meanings when they appear with and without the particle. It would seem rather that the meanings which they regularly convey are such that the accompaniment of *-za* is considered appropriate. I have subdivided the group of verbs into three classes. One, the verb *ḫaš-* "to give birth to, sire", can be explained on the basis of the criterion of "possession by the subject." The actor produces something which in the most basic sense is a part of him or herself. One cannot conceive of a subject siring or giving birth to something which is not recognizable as a part of himself. Thus for *-za ḫaš-* the same factor operates which calls for the particle in *nu-za DUMU.NITA.MEŠ DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ i-ya-ad-du*, "let him produce (for himself) sons and daughters" (VII 8 ii 9; Paškuwatti) and for its stand-in *-naš* in *nu-un-na-aš* (DUMU.NITA.MEŠ DUMU.MÍ.MEŠ *i-ya-u-e-en*, "and we produced (for ourselves) sons and daughters" (*Ḫatt.*, iii 4).

A second class, which includes the verbs *ilaliya-* "to desire," *malai-* "to approve, agree, consent," *markiya-* "to disapprove," *UL mem(m)a-* "to refuse," *kappuwai-* "to consider," *ḫa-* "to believe in, trust," *dušk-* "to rejoice, entertain (someone)," *ša(i)-* "to be angry," shows the common feature of a certain psychological subject orientation. These are verbs of thinking, reflecting, deciding, desiring and emoting. Yet certain other verbs of the same semantic class do not construe with *-za*: *A-BU-YA-ma kap-pí-la-az-za-at-ta* (2nd Plague Prayer of Muršili, XIV 8 i 23, *nu-kán A-NA LÚ.MEŠ A.ÍL.LÁ²⁶ kar-tim-mi-ya-nu-un*, "I became angry with the water-carriers" (XIII 3 iii 26-27; and all other occurrences of this verb known to me), *lelaniya-* (although all occurrences of the finite verb known to me are broken at the head of the clause). The verb *naḫ-* "to fear," which should belong in this semantic class, does not associate with *-za*, when

²⁶ This logogram, which is usually read LÚ.MEŠ A ŠA KUŠ.LAL by Hittitologists, has been differently interpreted by H. G. Güterbock, who privately suggested to me that the complex which resembles the signs ŠA + KUŠ should be read ÍL "to carry." Güterbock has called my attention to *SBoT* 7 (1968), 33, where von Soden remarks that the Hittite scribe writes "die unsinnige Folge KIL.KIL.SU" for the sign ÍL in the sequence ÍL.LÁ in *KBo* I 44+*KBo* XIII 1 iv 39. Since KIL.KIL.SU (that is KIL.KIL.KUŠ) would closely resemble ŠA+SU/KUŠ, Güterbock thinks that the "water-carriers" were expressed by LÚ.MEŠ A.ÍL.LÁ, an excellent solution.

²⁵ Götze, *ArOr* 5 (1933), 4 sub e.

it takes an object (that of which one is afraid). When it is used intransitively "to be afraid", it usually does take *-za* (or an enclitic pronoun of rank five referring back to the subject): *nu-wa-za-kán še-er na-a-ḫu-un* (XIII 35 ii 33), *le-e-wa-at-ta na-a-ḫi* (XXXIII 24 i 43), *le-e-ta na-a-ḫi* (XXX 33 i 15; 36 ii 8), although not infrequently the *-za* does not appear (especially in Old Hittite): *na-aš-ta na-aḫ-ta* (XXVIII 4 ii 30-31; OH myth of *Moon Falls from Heaven*), *LUGAL-uš-wa le-e na-aḫ-ti* "O king, don't be afraid!" (*KBo* XV 52 v 14; cf. 21), but also in late texts: *na-aḫ-mi-wa* (*Taw.*, ii 26), *[na]-aḫ-ḫe-eš-ki-mi-wa* (*Taw.*, ii 29), *nu-wa le-e na-a-ḫe-eš-ki-ši* (VIII 79 obv. 9), *nu na-a-ḫu-un* (XII 27 i 3; Muršili's speech loss). Therefore, although it is impossible to claim that *-za* construes with all verbs expressing emotional or rational activity, it is striking that verbs of this class are particularly susceptible to association with *-za*, because they characteristically stress subject involvement in the action denoted by the verb in a manner not true of most other verbs.

A third class of verbs which regularly associate with *-za* is made up of at least the following members: *waš-* "to buy," *uš(ša)niya-* "to put up for sale," *ḫappa/irai-* "to sell," *ḫappar iya-* "to transact business with." These verbs describe a two-sided action, that is, a transaction. Such two-sided action which were marked by *-za* seem to have been exclusively amicable, for verbs such as *zahḫiya-* "to fight with each other, do battle" and *argatiya-* "to come to grips, fight" do not associate with *-za*. This employment of the particle was not a late development, for we find it regularly appearing in Old Hittite texts with all of these verbs save *waš-* "to buy," which appears without the particle in the laws, but associates with it thereafter: *ŠA É.NA₄-ya-za A.ŠA...* *le-e ku-iš-ki wa-a-ši ma-a-an-za ... ku-iš-ki ... wa-a-ši*, (XIII 8: 15-18; Middle Hittite), *nu-za-ta* *SAG.DU-ZU wa-aš-ta*, "he has purchased his (own) 'head' (life)"

(XIII 9 ii 4; Middle Hittite, but see above, where it was noted that the *-za* may do double duty here, also expressing reinforcement for *-ZU* "his own"), *nu-za ku-it wa-ši-ya-zi* "that which he purchases" (XIII 4 ii 48-9, cf. 79), *ma-a-an-ma-za ... IR GEMÉ ku-iš-ki wa-aš-ši-ya-zi* (XXI 29 iii 36-37), *ḫa-me-iš-ḫi-za*!²⁷ *GUD-un le-e wa-aš-ti* "in the spring do not buy a cow" (IV 3 obv. 2). Apparent exception: *[nu]-wa GUD wa-ši-ya-nu-un* (XXXI 76 vi 8; R. Werner, *SBoT* 4 [1967], 26).

What determines the limits of a segment of speech over which the sentence enclitic particle continues to govern? Carruba (page 48) raises the question once, but offers no answer. Obviously in order to answer this question for Hittite one would need to examine the entire text corpus with special attention to the sentence particles. This I have not done. But from an examination of the sentences cited by Carruba (page 47) it would seem that in cases of asyndeton, when no particles from rank one separate the clauses, the force of the sentence enclitics carry over (see XXIX 1 iii 31ff. [unless *ma-a-an-na-at* in line 33 is to be analyzed as *mān-a-at*; and note that both *-war-* and *-za* might be expected in the second clause], XVII 10 iv 24-25 [but **Telepinuš-a* begins a new period in which *-za* is no longer appropriate, since he does not tend "his own" king and queen], *KBo* VI 34 ii 38-40).

On Carruba's etymology of *-z(a)*, PIE **swe*, **swoi*, I have nothing to say. As of the form *-z*, which in Old and Middle Hittite is an allomorph of *-za* but which falls out of use in Late Hittite, see my remarks in *JNES* 31 (1972), 18-21.

²⁷ Edition reads incorrectly *-a*. Collation already by Ehelolf apud Sommer, *AU* (1932), 391. Performed again unnecessarily by Kümmel (*Ugarit-Forschungen* 1 [1969], 165).